

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SELUNDO CHILIPE-ESCANDON,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. CR12-47 MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REDUCE SENTENCE PURSUANT
TO 18 U.S.C. § 3582

15
16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to reduce his sentence
17 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582. (Dkt. No. 1102.) Having considered the parties' briefing and the
18 related record, the Court hereby DENIES the motion.

19 **Background**

20 Defendant Selundo Chilipe-Escandon was sentenced on December 8, 2012, following his
21 conviction for Conspiracy to Distribute Controlled Substances. (Dkt. No. 742.) This Court
22 calculated his Total Offense Level as 27. Because Defendant's Criminal History Category was
23 II, the resulting Guidelines range was 78-97 months. This Court then varied downward from that
24 range, imposing a sentence of 60 months.

1 Defendant now moves the Court for reduction in sentence based on Amendment 788 to
2 the Sentencing Guidelines which made Amendment 782 to USSG §2D1.1 retroactively
3 applicable. (Dkt. No. 1102.) The Government opposes the motion. (Dkt. No. 1112.)

4 **Discussion**

5 Amendment 782 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines, which became effective
6 November 1, 2014, lowered the penalties for most drug offenses by reducing most base offense
7 levels contained in the USSG § 2D1.1 Drug Quantity table by two levels, and making other
8 related adjustments to this Guideline. Along with Amendment 782, the Sentencing Commission
9 adopted Amendment 788, which decreed that Amendment 782 may be applied retroactively to
10 lower the sentences of previously sentenced inmates. At issue in the instant motion is whether
11 this Court has authority to reduce Defendant's sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2).

12 In order to qualify for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) two conditions
13 must be met: (1) the defendant must have been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a
14 sentencing range that has been lowered by a retroactively applicable Guidelines amendment; and
15 (2) the sentence reduction sought must be consistent with the Sentencing Commission's
16 applicable policy statements. United States v. Waters, 771 F.3d 679, 680 (9th Cir. 2014) (per
17 curiam). A district court does not have jurisdiction to reduce the defendant's sentence unless
18 both criteria are met. See United States v. Wesson, 583 F.3d 728, 730 (9th Cir. 2009).

19 Under the retroactively effective amendments to USSG § 2D1.1, Defendant's Total
20 Offense Level would now be 25. This in turn results in an amended Guidelines range of 63–78
21 months. Because the sentence already imposed (60 months) is below the low end of the range as
22 calculated applying the amended Guidelines (63 months), the policy statement precludes any
23
24

1 reduction in sentence. See United States v. Davis, 739 F.3d 1222, 1224 (9th Cir. 2014). As
2 such, this Court is not authorized to reduce Defendant's sentence.

3 **Conclusion**

4 Defendant is ineligible for a reduction in sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) because
5 the sentence already imposed is below the low end of the amended Guidelines range.
6 Defendant's motion to reduce his sentence is therefore DENIED.

7 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

8 Dated this 23rd day of March, 2015.

9 

10 Marsha J. Pechman
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24